

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated May 14, 2007, is respectfully requested. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 54-73, and Applicant has amended claims 54, 65, and 73. Accordingly, claims 54-73 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments as can be confirmed by the Examiner.

A. Claim 73 Has Been Amended To Correct A Typographical Error Only.

Claim 73 is a dependent claim is intended to depend from claim 72. Due to a typographical error, claim 73 inadvertently recited that it depended from itself. Applicant therefore has amended claim 73 to correctly recite its dependence from claim 72. The amendment to claim 73 is made to correct the typographical error only and not for reasons of patentability.

B. The Cited Prior Art References Do Not Disclose or Suggest the Combination of Identifying a Request for Data Content from a Computer System as Being Associated with a SPAM Electronic Mail Message, Providing a Provider Identification Code Associated with a Content Provider System to an Invalid Response Database System, and Presenting a Dead Page to a Computer System Each if the Request Comprises an Invalid Data Request, Wherein the Dead Page States that a Hyperlink was Fraudulently Generated, as Recited in Claims 54-73.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 54-73 each under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being rendered obvious by Bezos et al., United States Patent No. 6,029,141, in view of Messer et al., United States Application Publication No. 2004/0230491, in further view of Angles et al., United States Patent No. 5,933,811, in still further view of Herz et al., United States Application Publication No. 2001/0014868. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that at least one recited element of independent claims 54 and 65, as amended, is totally missing from the cited prior art references, both individually and in combination. Accordingly, claims 54-73 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 54 and 65 have been amended herein to recite the combination of identifying a request from a computer system as being associated with a SPAM electronic mail message, providing a provider identification code associated with a content provider system to an invalid response database system, and presenting a dead page to the computer system each

if the request for data content comprises an invalid data request. The dead page presented to the computer system further is set forth as "stating that the hyperlink [activated at the computer system to provide the data request] was fraudulently generated." None of the cited prior art references, either individually or in combination, however, disclose or even suggest identifying a request from a computer system as being associated with a SPAM electronic mail message, providing a provider identification code associated with a content provider system to an invalid response database system, and presenting a dead page to the computer system each if the request for data content comprises an invalid data request.

According to the Examiner, Bezos et al. disclose "combining predetermined Content, an Interface Provider Identification Code, and a Dynamically-Generated User Identification Code to Form a Data Interface, Providing the Data Interface to a User System, and Receiving a Request for Selected Content that is Formed by Combining the Interface Provider Identification Code and the User Identification Code." The Examiner, however, acknowledges that Bezos et al. fail to disclose, among other claimed features: tracking invalid data requests; computer identification data that expire; and selected encryption standards. With reference to tracking invalid data requests, the Examiner relies solely upon teaching of Messer et al. to supplement the disclosure of Bezos et al. The Examiner further supplements the teaching of Bezos et al. with Angles et al. (expiring cookie information) and Herz et al. (different encryption standards).

None of the above references, either individually or in combination, disclose or even suggest identifying a request from a computer system as being associated with a SPAM electronic mail message, providing a provider identification code associated with a content provider system to an invalid response database system, and presenting a dead page to the computer system each if the request for data content comprises an invalid data request.

Turning to Messer et al., for example, the Examiner asserts that Messer et al. discloses both: (1) determining invalid requests for information and tracing invalid requests for information; and (2) utilizing a database and reporting for invalid requests. The Examiner, however, does not assert or cite any reference that Messer et al. teach, if the request for data content comprises an

invalid data request, presenting a dead page to the computer system, wherein the dead page "stat[es] that the hyperlink [activated at the computer system] was fraudulently generated."


In fact, Applicant notes that the term "dead page" does not even appear in Bezos et al., Messer et al., Angles et al., or Herz et al. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited prior art references for identifying a request from a computer system as being associated with a SPAM electronic mail message, providing a provider identification code associated with a content provider system to an invalid response database system, and presenting a dead page to the computer system each if the request for data content comprises an invalid data request, wherein the dead page states that the hyperlink was fraudulently generated." According, at least one recited element of claims 54 and 65 is totally missing from the cited prior art references. Applicant therefore submits that claims 54 and 65 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Bezos et al., Messer et al., Angles et al., or Herz et al. and that claims 54-73, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner therefore has not established a *prima facie* case under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because, as shown above, all of the elements of the pending claims are not found in the cited reference, either individually or in combination. For at least the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 54-73 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (949) 567-6700 if there is any way to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

Dated: October 31, 2007

By: 
Davin M. Stockwell
Reg. No. 41,334
Attorneys for Applicant

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, California 92614-2558
Telephone: (949) 567-6700
Facsimile: (949) 567-6710